DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 189 181 TM 800 363

AUTHOR Adams, Ronald D.: And Others
TITLE A Developmental Study of Teacher Concerns Across Time.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 42p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (64th, Boston, MA, April 7-11, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults: Beginning Teachers: *Factor Structure: Higher Education: Problems: Self Concept: Student Teachers: *Teacher Attitudes: Teacher Influence: *Teaching Experience: Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Concerns Checklist (Parsons and Fuller)

ABSTRACT

To test Fuller's self-task-impact theory of teacher concerns, the factor structure of the Teacher Concerns Checklist was replicated with student, beginning and experienced teachers. The levels of concern across the experience categories were compared. Two factors emerged for each concern: (1) self concerns for student and pupil perceptions: (2) task concerns for instruction and discipline: and (3) impact concerns for student learning, and student well-being. The analysis of variance showed significant differences between experience groups for self concern factors: student and beginning teachers were more concerned about pupil perceptions of self and adult perceptions of self. There were no significant differences for the task or impact factors across experience groups. Teachers at all levels were more concerned about academic impact on students than any other factor. The progression of task and impact concerns identified by this study did not support Fuller's theory. (CP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED189181

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A Developmental Study of Teacher Concerns Across Time

Authors: Ronald D. Adams
Sharla Hutchinson
Carl Martray

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Adams

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TM 800363

Paper Presented at
AERA Annual Conference

Boston, Massachusetts

April 9, 1980

The cost of printing this publication by Western Kentucky University was paid from state funds KRS 57.375.

INTRODUCTION

Much of the interest and work in teacher concerns have been accomplished at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin. In the late 1960's and early 1970's Francis Fuller and others studied the concerns of teachers primarily through interviews and open-ended responses to single questions (Fuller, 1969; Fuller and Case, 1970). Through this early study a teacher concerns theory emerged that suggested teacher concerns could be classified into three areas: 1) teacher's concern about self as a teacher, 2) teacher's concern about the tasks in teaching, and 3) teacher's concern with the impact of teaching on pupils. However, problems of statistical analysis necessary for accurately assessing teacher concerns and the time consuming process of data collection and training of coders and interviewers led to developmental efforts in producing a more objective instrument to measure teacher concerns.

The Teacher Concerns Checklist (TCC) was developed and field tested in the early seventies (Parsons and Fuller, 1972; Fuller, Parsons and Watkins, 1973; George, Borich and Fuller, 1974). The TCC, a 56 item Likert scaled instrument, was administered to both preservice teachers (n = 335) and inservice teachers (n = 345) in the Austin Independent School System. Factor analyses of these data yielded five factors, each represented by three items (George, Borich and Fuller, 1974; George, 1974). These factors were labeled as follows:

Factor 1: Concerns about being Liked

Factor 2: Concerns about Adequacy

Factor 3: Concerns about Teaching

Factor 4: Concerns about Role

Factor 5: Concerns about Pupil Needs

However, the five factor scores were confusing when applied to the self-task-impact concerns theory. Recently, George (1978) extracted a three factor solution more closely corresponding with the developmental stages of concern originally suggested by Fuller. Again, 15 representative items were selected, five per factor.

One objective of this study was to reconsider the five factor constructure originally obtained from the TCC and attempt to replicate the three factor solution of the TCC proposed by George (1978). A second objective was to explore the progression of teacher concerns across experience levels to test the self-task-impact concern theory proposed by Fuller (1969).

SAMPLE

The Teacher Concerns Checklist was included in the battery of instruments administered by the Teacher Preparation Evaluation Program (TPEP) at Western Kentucky University for the years 1976 through 1979. However, the 1976 data were not usable due to a different response scale that was utilized for this period. Thus, the data for this study were collected in the spring of 1977, 1978, and 1979. Data were obtained from 112 student teachers, 72 first year teachers and 83 third and fifth year teachers, all participants in the TPEP.

Three groups of teachers were identified for purposes of this study. The student teacher responses formed the student group, the first year teacher responses formed the beginning teacher group and the third and fifth year teacher responses formed the experienced teacher group. The TPEP did not follow teachers beyond five years. As part of the TPEP instrumentation, the TCC was administered each year to student teachers, first year teachers, third year teachers, and fifth year teachers. It was necessary to consider completed instruments rather than individual teachers as subjects. For the purposes of this study, each completed TCC was treated as a separate subject.

While potentially four of the TCC's could be the product of one person during different time periods, this was not the case due to the recent introduction of the TCC into an already existing evaluation program. Most of the data were from single or double administrations. Each TCC was presumed to be representative of the teacher's concerns at that particular developmental stage.

PROCEDURE

The Teacher Concerns Checklist was administered, as part of a battery of instruments, to TPEP participants during the spring semester. Each teacher was contacted in February of each year by the TPEP staff and arrangements made for two visits later in the semester. A TCC was given to the participant at the first visit and collected at the second visit approximately one week later. The entire data collection period for each year began in March and was completed by the first week in May.

Data from the original TCC instruments were key punched onto computer cards, verified, and transferred to computer tape for analyses. Statistical analyses were made utilizing subprograms from the Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (NIE, et. al., 1975). For the first objective, the orthogonal rotation VARIMAX subprogram was used to obtain the factor solutions, a procedure that maximizes the "independence" of the factors. Criteria for items selected as representative of the individual factors were based on the item loadings and the logic of the content of the item, a procedure utilized by George (1978). In addition, each factor selected had eigen values of one or greater, also similar to the procedures used by George.

Objective two was met through analyses of data via "Subprogram One Way", an Analysis of Variance Subprogram with A Posteriori contrasts. For ANOVA tests that were significant at the .05 level, Scheffe' tests ($p = .10$) were computed to determine between group differences.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF OBJECTIVE ONE

The VARIMAX rotation option of the Factor Analysis subprogram produced sets of items that loaded reasonably high and were logically consistent to form factors or constructs generally supporting the self, task, and impact concerns theory. An intercorrelation matrix of factor scores was computed to provide a measure of the degree of relationship among factors and for each factor a measure of reliability, Cronbach's alpha, was computed to determine the degree of internal consistency of the items to the factor score. The discussion of findings for objective one follows for each of the concern areas: self, task, and impact. They are discussed separately in relation to the findings of George (1978) and relative to experience levels of teachers. Appendix A contains the factor analyses of each experience group.

Self Concerns

Twelve of the 56 items of the TCC clearly were self concerns that teachers may have in dealing with students, peers, supervisors, in the educational setting. These items were 1, 6, 16, 17, 18, 21, 25, 26, 31, 37, 46, and 48. (See Appendix B for specific item content). George found the following items to be representative of a self concerns factor from a sample of preservice and inservice teachers:

Item 17 - Maintaining the appropriate degree of class control,
Item 21 - Doing well when a supervisor is present,
Item 25 - Getting a favorable evaluation of my teaching,
Item 46 - Feeling more adequate as a teacher, and
Item 48 - Being accepted and respected by professional persons.

Items 21, 25, and 48 loaded highest .70, .70, and .61, respectively, with items 17 and 46 loading somewhat lower with .44 and .45, respectively.

TPEP findings for the total group paralleled Georges' findings. Table 1 presents the item loadings for George's "self concerns" factor for both the Texas and TPEP analysis. It can be observed that items 17 and 46 are also low for the total TPEP analysis.

TABLE 1

FACTOR LOADINGS FOR ITEMS IDENTIFIED BY THE TEXAS STUDY AS SELF CONCERNS FOR THE TEXAS AND TOTAL TPEP SAMPLE

	Texas	Total TPEP
Item 17	.44	.35
Item 21	.70	.75
Item 25	.70	.77
Item 46	.45	.33
Item 48	.61	.57

When the factor analyses were applied separately to experience groups, i.e., student teachers, beginning teachers, and experienced teachers, a structure was obtained that supported a division of self concerns into two separate factors for the two less experienced groups. There appeared to be a pupil oriented self concern and an adult oriented self concern. For both student teachers and first year teachers, a pupil self concern factor (SelfP) was found comprised of the following items.

Item 6 - Whether the students really like me or not,
Item 18 - Acceptance as a friend by students, and
Item 37 - How students feel about me.

Factor loadings for these items across experience levels are presented in Table 2.

Another factor was found for these two experience levels that dealt with teachers concerns about adult perceptions (SelfA). This factor was comprised of the following items:

Item 21 - Doing well when a supervisor is present,
Item 25 - Getting a favorable evaluation of my teaching, and
Item 48 - Being accepted and respected by professional persons.

Factor loadings for these items can be seen in Table 3.

TABLE 2

FACTOR LOADINGS FOR ITEMS IDENTIFIED
AS SELFP CONCERNS ACROSS EXPERIENCE LEVELS

	Total[1]	Student[2]	Beginning[3]	Experienced[4]
Item 6	.72	.74	.62	.78
Item 18	.74	.80	.72	.71
Item 37	.65	.70	.58	.78

1 Factor 6 for Total group (n = 265)
2 Factor 5 for Student group (n = 112)
3 Factor 7 for Beginning group (n = 71)
4 Factor 2 for Experienced group (n = 82)

TABLE 3

FACTOR LOADINGS FOR ITEMS IDENTIFIED
AS SELFA CONCERNS ACROSS EXPERIENCE LEVELS

	Total[1]	Student[2]	Beginning[3]	Experienced[4]
Item 21	.75	.70	.83	.76
Item 25	.77	.83	.77	.68
Item 48	.57	.52	.70	.41

1 Factor 3 for Total group
2 Factor 6 for Student group
3 Factor 2 for Beginning group
4 Factor 2 for Experienced group

It should be noted that the concern for adult perceptions factor (SelfA) incorporates the three highest loading items of the five items reported by George as teachers' self concern. Items 17 and 46 did not load highly for either of the inexperienced groups. Low factor loadings, similar to these obtained by George, of .39 and .36 for items 17 and 46 (for the student teacher group) and .34 and .27 (for beginning teachers) were obtained in this study. Low loadings as well as item content convinced the authors to delete these items from the TPEP self concerns factor.

A somewhat different factor solution was obtained for the experienced group of teachers. The self concern factor for this group was a combination of items from both the adult and pupil concern factors found for the inexperienced groups. Thus, student teachers and first year teachers seem to differentiate between their concerns for respect and affection from pupils and from adults, while more experienced teachers tend to be concerned about these pupil and adult perceptions similarly.

Correlation coefficients were computed for the Texas self concerns factor and the two factors obtained from the TPEP study, SelfA and SelfP. Table 4 presents correlation matrices for the total and each experience group. The correlation coefficients are similar for each group with SelfA correlating very high with the Texas factor in each group. This would be expected due to the common items of these two factors. The SelfP factor correlates only moderately with the Texas factor and SelfA factor across each group. These correlations suggest that the SelfA and Texas factors are measuring the same construct, concern for adult perceptions, while the SelfP factor measures a somewhat different construct of concern for pupil perceptions. It should be noted that the SelfP is more highly correlated with the SelfA and Texas factors for the experienced teachers. Again, this would be expected due to the combined factor solution obtained for experienced teachers.

TABLE 4

INTERCORRELATION MATRICIES BETWEEN SELF CONCERN FACTORS FOR TEACHER EXPERIENCE GROUPS

TOTAL GROUP

(N = 265)

	Texas Self	Self A	Self P
Texas Self	1.00	.94	.69
Self A		1.00	.64
Self P			1.00

STUDENT GROUP

(N = 112)

	Texas Self	Self A	Self P
Texas Self	1.00	.93	.62
Self A		1.00	.54
Self P			1.00

BEGINNING GROUP

(N = 71)

	Texas Self	Self A	Self P
Texas Self	1.00	.94	.67
Self A		1.00	.62
Self P			1.00

EXPERIENCED GROUP

(N = 82)

	Texas Self	Self A	Self P
Texas Self	1.00	.93	.72
Self A		1.00	.68
Self P			1.00

Alpha reliability coefficients for the total and each experience group are reported in Table 5. These coefficients are all above .70 and all but two above .80. These coefficients are within an acceptable range showing good internal consistency for the two factors.

Task Concerns

Two constructs related to teacher tasks were extracted from TPEP data using factor analysis. The first dealt with instructional or academic related task concerns, similar to George's findings, and a second construct was obtained involving classroom discipline. Although the discipline factor did emerge from the Texas analyses, no interpretation was made in the George (1978) report.

George found items 12, 14, 15, 27, and 29 to be most representative of teacher task concerns. Content of these items follow:

Item 12 - Lack instructional material,
Item 14 - Feeling under pressure too much of the time,
Item 15 - The routine and inflexibility of the situation,
Item 27 - Too many non-instructional duties, and
Item 29 - Working with too many students each day.

The Texas factor reported by George was somewhat applicable to the total group analysis of the TPEP sample data. Table 6 compares the Texas and TPEP factor analyses. The major differences were noted for Items 12 and 27. A more representative Task factor for the total and student teacher groups in the TPEP study was obtained by deleting Items 12 and 27 of the Texas structure and substituting the following two items:

Item 16 - Becoming too personally involved with students, and
Item 43 - Lack of academic freedom.

Table 7 presents the new factor structure and item loadings for each experience group. It becomes evident that this factor structure holds primarily for the total and student groups.

The cost of printing this publication by Western Kentucky University was paid from state funds KRS 57.375

TABLE 5

ALPHA COEFFICIENTS OF SELF FACTORS FOR
EACH TEACHER EXPERIENCE GROUP

Group	Texas Self	Self A	Self P
Total	.83	.82	.88
Student	.79	.73	.85
Beginning	.84	.87	.90
Experienced	.83	.85	.89

TABLE 6

FACTOR LOADINGS FOR ITEMS IDENTIFIED BY THE
TEXAS STUDY AS INSTRUCTIONAL TASK CONCERNS

	$Texas_1$	$Total_2$	$Student_3$	$Beginning_4$	$Experienced_5$
Item 12	.40	.11	.09	.21	-.07
Item 14	.57	.66	.70	.10	.19
Item 15	.59	.74	.69	.36	.86
Item 27	.51	.28	.43	.50	-.01
Item 29	.54	.53	.70	.82	.06

1 As reported by George (1978)
2 Factor 4 for Total Group
3 Factor 4 for Student Group
4 Factor 10 for Beginning Group
5 Factor 8 for Experienced Group

TABLE 7

FACTOR LOADINGS FOR ITEMS IDENTIFIED AS
INSTRUCTIONAL TASK CONCERNS FOR TPEP TOTAL AND STUDENT GROUPS

	Total[1]	Student[2]	Beginning[3]	Experienced[4]
Item 14	.66	.70	.72	.19
Item 15	.74	.69	.47	.86
Item 16	.48	.57	.42	.23
Item 29	.52	.70	.09	.06
Item 43	.44	.53	.24	.49

1 Factor 4 for Total group (n = 265)
2 Factor 4 for Student group (n = 112)
3 Factor 4 for Beginning group (n = 71)
4 Factor 8 for Experienced group (n = 82)

While beginning group data were somewhat consistent with the total and student group factor solution, a more representative factor for the beginning group was obtained by the following factor structure:

Item 4 - The mandated curriculum is not appropriate for all students,
Item 11 - Working productively with other teachers,
Item 14 - Feeling under pressure too much of the time,
Item 34 - Understanding the philosophy of the school, and
Item 46 - Feeling more adequate as a teacher.

Table 8 presents the item loadings on this factor for each group. It again becomes evident that this solution is most appropriate for beginning teacher data.

Yet another structure emerged for the experienced group. Only three items seemed to be measuring the task concerns of this group. They were as follows:

TABLE 8

FACTOR LOADINGS FOR ITEMS IDENTIFIED AS
INSTRUCTIONAL TASK CONCERNS FOR TPEP BEGINNING TEACHER GROUP

	Total[1]	Student[2]	Beginning[3]	Experienced[4]
Item 4	.23	.23	.54	.06
Item 11	-.04	.04	.59	.46
Item 14	.66	.70	.72	.08
Item 34	.13	.12	.57	.71
Item 46	.36	.39	.63	.19

1 Factor 4 for Total group (n = 265)
2 Factor 4 for Student group (n = 112)
3 Factor 4 for Beginning group (n = 71)
4 Factor 3 for Experienced group (n = 82)

Item 13 - Rapid rate of curriculum and instructional change,
Item 15 - The routine and inflexibility of the situation, and
Item 43 - Lack of academic freedom.

Table 9 presents the factor structure best suited for Task concerns of experienced teachers. Item 13 had the lowest loading for the student and beginning teacher groups. Since this factor assumes knowledge of past procedures, this inconsistency appears understandable.

A factor characterized by teacher concern for classroom discipline was obtained from both the TPEP analyses and the Texas analyses. These items were surprisingly consistent across both analyses and across experience groups. The following items represented this discipline factor:

Item 1 - Lack of respect of some students,
Item 17 - Maintaining the appropriate degree of class control,
Item 31 - The values and attitudes of the current generation, and
Item 35 - Students who disrupt class.

TABLE 9

FACTOR LOADINGS FOR ITEMS IDENTIFIED AS
INSTRUCTIONAL TASK CONCERNS FOR TPEP EXPERIENCED GROUP

	Total[1]	Student[2]	Beginning[3]	Experienced[4]
Item 13	.37	.20	.17	.50
Item 15	.74	.69	.51	.86
Item 43	.44	.52	.56	.49

1 Factor 4 for Total Group (n = 265)
2 Factor 4 for Student Group (n = 112)
3 Factor 3 for Beginning Group (n = 71)
4 Factor 8 for Experienced Group (n = 82)

This factor was interpreted as a task concerns factor even though there may be some items that could belong to self or impact concerns. Table 10 contains the factor loadings for this factor. Experienced teacher data were not as stable in this factor for items 1 and 35. An explanation for this apparent weaker factor structure could be that experienced teachers do not view discipline in the same way as do neophyte teachers. For example, Item 16, "Becoming too personally involved with students," loaded high with the discipline items for experienced teachers (.52) and indicated a somewhat different concern than unruly behavior.

An intercorrelation matrix was computed for each group to determine if the identified factors were measuring similar or different constructs. Table 11 presents these matrices. It appears that there was a moderate to high correlation between each of the instructional task factors with the experienced group having the lowest correlation coefficients. The Discipline Task factor scores did not correlate as highly with the instructional task factor scores,

TABLE 10

FACTOR LOADINGS FOR ITEMS IDENTIFIED AS DISCIPLINE TASK CONCERNS

	Texas[1]	Total[2]	Student[3]	Beginning[4]	Experienced[5]
Item 1	.63	.75	.59	.84	.10
Item 17	.43	.62	.36	.54	.52
Item 31	.41	.43	.66	.41	.68
Item 35	.59	.60	.48	.79	.23

1 As reported by George (1978) Factor 5
2 Factor 5 for Total Group
3 Factor 8 for Student Group
4 Factor 5 for Beginning Group
5 Factor 5 for Experienced Group

implying a different construct was being measured. When the factor scores of the beginning and experienced groups were correlated with the total/student factor scores for their respective groups, coefficients of .72 and .84, respectively, were obtained. These correlations were high enough to support the use of the total/student structure as the most appropriate general measure of instructional task concern for each group. When this factor structure was used for each group, correlation coefficients of .51, .51, .48, and .49 was obtained between Instructional Task and Discipline Task, indicating a moderately low correlation exists between these constructs. This again implied that these factors were measuring relatively independent constructs even though both were considered task related.

TABLE 11

INTERCORRELATION MATRICIES BETWEEN TASK FACTORS FOR TEACHER EXPERIENCE GROUPS

	Texas	Total & Student	Beginning	Experienced	Discipline
Total Group					
Texas	1.00	.88	.63	.77	.44
Total&Student		1.00	.67	.86	.51
Beginning			1.00	.68	.64
Experienced				1.00	.50
Discipline					1.00
Student Group					
Texas	1.00	.91	.73	.82	.52
Total&Student		1.00	.69	.86	.51
Beginning			1.00	.70	.61
Experienced				1.00	.48
Discipline					1.00
Beginning Group					
Texas	1.00	.86	.62	.81	.38
Total&Student		1.00	.72	.90	.48
Beginning			1.00	.73	.64
Experienced				1.00	.54
Discipline					1.00
Experienced Group					
Texas	1.00	.83	.50	.67	.34
Total&Student		1.00	.55	.84	.49
Beginning			1.00	.57	.59
Experienced				1.00	.43
Discipline					1.00

Measures of internal consistency (alpha coefficients), using the total/student instructional factor and the discipline factor for all experience groups, are presented in Table 12. All values for total, student, and beginning groups were at acceptable levels of consistency. However, the alpha coefficients for the experienced group data indicated a weaker internal consistency and may not produce as reliable a measure for experienced teachers. An instructional task factor consistency coefficient of .67 was reported by George (1978). He theorized that this lower internal consistency was the result of a wider variety of concerns measured by the task factor. This study supported this theory for experienced teachers, but not for student or beginning teachers.

TABLE 12

ALPHA COEFFICIENTS FOR TASK FACTORS
FOR EACH TEACHER EXPERIENCE GROUP

Group	Instructional Task	Discipline Task
Total	.75	.75
Student	.82	.77
Beginning	.76	.80
Experienced	.64	.69

Impact Concerns

As was the case for Self and Task concerns, two related constructs emerged from the TPEP data analyses. An academic teacher impact concern was produced from the factor analyses that was similar to the impact factor reported by George (1978). A second factor that included items representing environmental influences was found for the TPEP data. No similar structure was apparent in the Texas study.

George selected the following items to represent the Texas factor:

Item 22 - Meeting the needs of different kinds of students,
Item 24 - Diagnosing student learning problems,
Item 30 - Challenging unmotivated students,
Item 47 - Guiding students toward intellectual and emotional growth, and
Item 53 - Whether each student is getting what he needs.

It should be noted that this factor included items that dealt with teacher impact on student learning, i.e., an academic impact. When TPEP data were analyzed, the same factor structure was found for the total, student, and experienced groups. Only for the beginning group was there a weak factor loading found for these items. Table 13 gives the factor loadings for the academic factor structure.

TABLE 13

FACTOR LOADINGS FOR ITEMS IDENTIFIED AS ACADEMIC IMPACT CONCERNS

	Texas	Total	Student	Beginning	Experienced
Item 22	.72	.84	.70	.55	.87
Item 24	.71	.70	.75	.36	.64
Item 30	.66	.75	.68	.29	.72
Item 47	.69	.64	.28	.58	.71
Item 53	.70	.76	.46	.33	.75

A different group of items formed a more representative academic impact factor structure for the beginning teacher group. This new factor was as follows:

Item 5 - Whether students are learning what they should,
Item 7 - Increasing student's feelings of accomplishment,
Item 10 - Motivating students to study,
Item 47 - Guiding students toward intellectual and emotional growth, and
Item 52 - Helping students to value learning.

Table 14 contains the factor loadings for these items for each group and for the Texas analyses.

TABLE 14

Comparisons of Factor Loadings for Items Identified As Academic Impact Concerns Identified for Beginning Teachers

	Texas	Total	Student	Beginning	Experienced
Item 5	.44	.67	.39	.72	.73
Item 7	.63	.72	.37	.74	.81
Item 10	.52	.69	.54	.65	.72
Item 47	.69	.64	.28	.58	.71
Item 52	.61	.67	.45	.59	.68

It is important to note that the impact factor was the first and strongest factor formed in both the Texas and TPEP studies. Many of the impact items had high loadings (see Appendix A). This implied a general concern of teachers for students' academic well being. A reasonable item loading was obtained for each experience group on both factors with the total and experienced groups having particularly high loadings. This indicated a consistency of measurement of the academic impact concern construct.

A second factor was found for each of the experience groups that dealt with teacher concerns for the students' general well being within the school environment. The items identified for this factor were as follows:

Item 38 - Student health and nutrition problems that affect learning,
Item 39 - The psychological climate of the school,
Item 42 - Chronic absence and dropping out of students, and
Item 45 - Student use of drugs.

Table 15 presents the item loadings. This factor was evident across each of the experience levels.

TABLE 15

FACTOR LOADINGS FOR ITEMS IDENTIFIED AS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CONCERNS

	Total	Student	Beginning	Experience
Item 36	.69	.61	.43	.58
Item 39	.64	.49	.51	.66
Item 42	.71	.77	.49	.47
Item 45	.64	.76	.46	.73

Total = Factor 2
Student = Factor 2
Beginning = Factor 3
Experienced = Factor 4

An intercorrelation matrix for each experience level indicated the similarity between the construct being measured by the Texas Impact factor and the factor selected as representative of beginning teacher impact concerns. High coefficients supported a reciprocal usage between the Texas and the new TPEP impact factor structures. Since the Texas factor best represented all other experience groups, it was selected to also represent the beginning teacher group in further analysis. The second impact factor, measuring environmental concerns, correlated only moderately with both other

The cost of printing this publication by Western Kentucky University was paid from state funds KRS 57.375.

impact structures, indicating the assessment of somewhat similar, yet distinct, constructs. This intercorrelation matrix is presented in Table 16.

TABLE 16

INTERCORRELATION MATRICES BETWEEN THE TEXAS, TPEP BEGINNING TEACHER, AND TPEP ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT FACTORS

	Texas	TPEP Beginning Teacher	Environmental
Total Group			
Texas	1.00	.86	.63
TPEP Beginning		1.00	.62
Environmental			1.00
Student			
Texas	1.00	.87	.62
TPEP Beginning		1.00	.65
Environmental			1.00
Beginning			
Texas	1.00	.83	.63
TPEP Beginning		1.00	.60
Environmental			1.00
Experienced			
Texas	1.00	.86	.60
TPEP Beginning		1.00	.55
Environmental			1.00

Alpha coefficients for the two impact factors, academic and environmental, can be seen in Table 17. Coefficients across all experience groups were .80 or greater. Good internal consistency was indicated by these high coefficients.

TABLE 17

ALPHA COEFFICIENTS FOR IMPACT FACTORS
FOR EACH EXPERIENCE GROUP

Group	Factor	Academic Impact	Environmental Impact
Total		.87	.82
Student		.86	.84
Beginning		.83	.79
Experienced		.90	.80

Summary of Objective One

In summary, two factors were found for each of the concerns dimensions reported by Fuller (1969) and George (1978). The self concern constructs had both a concern for adult perceptions of self factor similar to that reported by George and a concern for pupil perceptions of self factor. The latter factor was of particular importance for inexperienced teachers as the two concerns appeared to be independent constructs for these groups.

The instructional task concern construct was not as consistent across experience groups as were the other factors. However, the correlations obtained between the factors supported the use of the "total/student" factor structure as a general measure of instructional task concern across all experience levels. The discipline task concern was a stable measure for all experience levels, however, it was somewhat weaker for the experienced teacher group. This factor was also evident in the George study, but unreported.

Teacher concerns for school impact on students appeared to be of two types. The first was the impact of teacher and school on pupil learning and growth. This factor was the same as the Texas factor for impact. It was also the strongest factor formed for both the Texas and TPEP studies. The second impact concerns factor dealt with students general well-being within the school environment, a factor not apparent in the Texas study.

These factor solutions supported the findings of George, but also identified additional factors particularly appropriate for the different experience levels of teachers. While somewhat different solutions emerged for the various experience levels, a most representative factor was selected that could be applied across all experience levels.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF OBJECTIVE TWO

Objective two of this study was to test the developmental progression theory of teacher concerns by comparing student, beginning, and experienced teacher concerns as measured by the six factors reported in objective one. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) and A posteriori Scheffe' tests were applied to the TPEP data to determine if significant differences existed across experience groups for the various concern measures. Subprogram Oneway of the SPSS was utilized in these analyses. An alpha level of .05 was set for the ANOVA and an alpha level of .10 was utilized with the Scheffe' tests. These alpha levels are consistent with accepted practice in using these statistical techniques.

Self Concerns

Mean responses for student, beginning, and experienced groups on the SelfA factor were 3.48, 3.28, and 2.94, respectively. Table 18 contains the means and standard deviations for Self Concern factors. Analyses of variance produced a significant F value indicating a difference existed

between groups for this measure. Further analyses via the Scheffe' tests indicated a significant difference between student teacher and experienced teacher group means. While significant differences were not obtained between the student teacher and beginning teacher groups, the means for these three groups portray a linear progression from most to least concern with experience. Table 19 presents the summary ANOVA table for the SelfA concern factor.

TABLE 18

Means and Standard Deviations for Self Factors Across Experience Levels

	Mean	SD	N
SelfA			
Student	3.48	0.90	113
Beginning	3.28	1.05	71
Experienced	2.94	1.07	82
Self P			
Student	3.13	0.98	113
Beginning	2.72	1.10	71
Experienced	2.60	1.03	81

TABLE 19

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR SELFA

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	P
Between	2	13.71	6.86	6.96	0.00
Within	263	258.91	0.98		
Total	265	272.62			

The SelfP factor produced means of 3.13, 2.72, and 2.60 for student, beginning, and experienced groups, respectively, and were also found to be significantly different via the ANOVA tests. Scheffe' tests indicated that significant differences existed between the student teacher group and both the beginning group and the experienced group. A similar progression was observed for the SelfP factor as for the SelfA factor indicating a decrease in concern for self with experience. These progressions supported the theoretical postulates of Fuller (1969) and George (1978) of a decrease in self concerns as teachers gain experience. Table 20 contains the summary ANOVA table for the SelfP factor.

TABLE 20

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR SELFP

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	P
Between	2	15.09	7.54	7.13	0.00
Within	262	277.44	1.06		
Total	264	292.53			

There appears to be a more rapid decrease in teachers concern about pupil perceptions than about adult perceptions as evidenced by the Scheffe' analyses. As first year teachers, concern about pupil evaluation has already significantly decreased from student teaching. Concern about adult evaluation appears to continue at a higher level until more experience has been gained.

Task Concerns

When the analysis of variance statistical techniques were applied to the instructional and discipline concern factor scores, no significant differences were obtained across the teacher experience groups. The linear progression of high to low concerns observed for self concerns was present in the discipline task means, but not in the instructional task means. However, the differences between means were quite small and statistically not significant indicating that experience probably is not related to task concerns. Tables 21 and 22 contain the summary ANOVA for task concerns.

TABLE 21

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR INSTRUCTIONAL TASK

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	P
Between	2	0.55	0.28	0.42	0.66
Within	261	173.05	0.66		
Total	263	173.60			

TABLE 22

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR DISCIPLINE TASK

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	P
Between	2	1.65	0.83	1.02	0.36
Within	261	211.99	0.81		
Total	263	213.65			

An interesting observation was made in the magnitude of concern for the two task variables. The level of concern that teachers have for instructional tasks appears to be considerably lower than for discipline tasks. Instructional task concern means across groups were 2.48, 2.41, and 2.53 for student, beginning and experienced teachers, respectively, while discipline task means were 3.58, 3.45, and 3.39, respectively. Table 23 contains the means and standard deviations for both factor scores by group. This observation was not subjected to statistical analyses and can not be regarded as more than speculation at this time.

TABLE 23

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR TASK FACTORS ACROSS EXPERIENCE LEVELS

	Mean	SD	N
Instructional Task			
Student	2.48	0.85	113
Beginning	2.41	0.84	71
Experienced	2.53	0.73	80
Discipline Task			
Student	3.58	0.86	113
Beginning	3.45	0.96	71
Experienced	3.39	0.90	80

Impact Concerns

Mean responses obtained on the Academic Impact factor for student, beginning and experienced teachers were 4.13, 4.05, and 3.91, respectively. No significant difference was found for these means via ANOVA. However, the same pattern of decrease in means across experience groups was noted for the academic impact factor as was found for self concerns and discipline task concerns. The summary ANOVA table for academic impact concerns is Table 24.

The Environmental Impact factor produced means of 3.32, 3.00, and 2.99 for student, beginning and experienced teachers. Differences between these means approached significance (p = .057). Again, a pattern of decreasing concern was found for this concern factor. Table 25 presents a summary of the ANOVA.

TABLE 24

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR ACADEMIC IMPACT

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	P
Between	2	2.21	1.10	1.88	0.16
Within	263	154.85	0.59		
Total	265	157.06			

TABLE 25

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	P
Between	2	6.79	3.40	2.88	.057
Within	261	307.30	1.18		
Total	263	314.10			

The magnitude of concern for the academic impact factor was the largest of any of the concern factors. Apparently, teachers of all experience levels were more concerned about their impact on students than any of the other factors measured in this study. However, this is again speculation and has not been subjected to rigorous statistical analyses. Means and standard deviations for the impact concern factors are contained in Table 26.

TABLE 26

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR IMPACT FACTORS ACROSS EXPERIENCE LEVELS

	Mean	SD	N
Academic Impact			
Student	4.13	0.72	113
Beginning	4.05	0.67	71
Experienced	3.91	0.89	82
Environmental Impact			
Student	3.32	1.12	113
Beginning	3.00	1.48	70
Experienced	2.99	1.07	81

Summary of Objective Two

The Analyses of Variance and Scheffe' tests provided evidence of significant differences between experience groups for both self concern factors, with the least experienced group having greater concern than the more experienced groups. No significant differences were noted for the Task Concern or Impact Concern variables across experience groups. However, ANOVA of environ-

mental concerns approached significance. The progression of task and impact concerns identified by this study did not provide support for Fuller's concern theory.

The cost of printing this publication by Western Kentucky University was paid from state funds KRS 57.375.

APPENDIX A

VARIMAX FACTOR LOADINGS FOR EACH OF 56 ITEMS
ON THE TCC ON EACH OF TEN FACTORS

FACTOR LOADINGS FOR STUDENT TEACHERS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	0.20	0.07	0.18	0.16	0.22	0.05	-0.00	0.59	0.11	0.08
2	0.14	0.19	0.06	0.13	0.07	0.06	0.04	0.17	0.71	0.19
3	0.41	-0.01	0.33	0.12	0.36	0.14	-0.02	0.06	0.17	0.42
4	0.25	0.17	0.06	0.23	0.07	0.03	0.58	0.02	0.19	0.05
5	0.39	0.15	0.31	0.09	0.16	0.08	0.39	0.04	0.34	-0.02
6	0.12	0.05	0.17	0.16	0.74	0.20	0.19	-0.01	0.16	0.26
7	0.37	0.25	0.42	0.02	0.15	-0.00	0.54	0.12	-0.16	-0.04
8	0.37	0.44	0.12	0.11	0.12	0.12	0.29	0.33	-0.04	0.33
9	0.23	0.11	0.31	0.08	0.10	0.39	0.29	0.43	-0.15	0.08
10	0.54	0.12	0.37	-0.01	0.18	-0.09	0.12	0.36	-0.03	0.22
11	0.27	0.47	0.14	0.04	0.21	-0.02	0.07	0.08	0.21	0.55
12	0.22	0.51	-0.04	0.08	0.17	0.12	0.32	0.21	0.18	0.33
13	-0.01	0.45	0.13	0.20	0.10	-0.07	0.22	0.37	0.21	0.37
14	-0.12	0.05	0.20	0.70	0.25	0.13	0.05	0.07	0.07	0.10
15	0.07	0.11	0.08	0.69	0.17	0.13	0.37	-0.01	0.06	0.07
16	0.08	0.25	0.02	0.57	0.19	0.03	0.06	0.36	0.32	0.04
17	0.24	0.05	0.18	0.28	0.38	0.39	-0.22	0.36	0.05	0.05
18	0.12	0.19	0.06	0.13	0.80	0.10	0.10	0.16	-0.03	-0.12
19	0.02	0.60	0.19	0.09	0.22	0.28	0.17	0.12	0.17	0.16
20	0.37	0.26	0.19	0.18	0.24	0.12	0.57	0.10	-0.02	0.02
21	-0.04	0.05	0.09	0.20	0.33	0.70	0.05	0.03	0.02	-0.13
22	0.70	0.10	0.22	0.15	-0.03	0.11	0.28	0.10	0.05	0.11
23	0.61	0.26	0.09	-0.00	0.22	0.18	0.03	0.22	-0.02	0.10
24	0.75	0.18	0.16	0.01	0.01	0.08	0.23	0.02	0.22	0.13
25	0.13	0.01	0.19	-0.02	0.08	0.83	-.09	0.08	0.11	0.06
26	0.18	0.25	-0.09	0.15	0.18	0.16	0.20	0.39	0.43	-0.11
27	0.01	0.20	0.09	0.44	0.20	0.16	0.10	0.00	0.59	0.05
28	0.79	0.16	0.16	0.05	0.17	0.08	-0.09	-0.13	0.04	0.01
29	0.37	0.18	0.04	0.70	-0.11	-0.06	0.04	0.13	0.10	0.01
30	0.68	0.18	0.35	0.10	0.14	-0.23	0.12	0.13	0.04	-0.08
31	0.05	0.31	0.31	0.17	-0.03	0.08	0.12	0.66	0.15	0.09
32	0.54	0.16	0.26	0.17	-0.01	0.22	0.28	0.31	0.06	0.11
33	0.73	0.14	0.22	0.05	0.11	0.17	0.16	0.18	0.00	-0.01
34	0.18	0.50	0.34	0.12	0.13	0.34	0.20	0.25	0.18	0.04
35	0.30	0.20	0.32	0.00	0.39	0.15	-0.13	0.48	0.14	-0.09
36	0.29	0.26	0.70	-0.03	0.23	0.12	0.08	0.18	0.03	0.04
37	0.18	0.09	0.16	0.09	0.70	0.29	0.10	0.11	0.22	0.23
38	0.21	0.61	0.32	0.11	-0.02	0.13	0.32	-0.08	0.21	-0.09
39	0.27	0.49	0.33	0.16	0.03	0.09	0.32	0.01	0.14	-0.31
40	0.12	0.24	0.21	0.08	0.28	0.32	0.19	0.13	0.15	-0.01
41	0.22	0.33	0.23	0.13	0.10	0.08	0.14	0.06	0.00	0.09
42	0.29	0.77	0.14	0.05	0.13	0.06	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.11
43	0.16	0.59	0.04	0.53	0.04	0.14	0.22	0.07	0.10	-0.18
44	0.42	0.56	0.18	0.33	-0.08	-0.09	0.04	0.07	0.06	0.13
45	0.15	0.76	0.17	0.14	0.11	0.07	0.07	0.29	0.09	0.02
46	0.04	0.24	0.43	0.39	0.25	0.36	-0.09	0.09	-0.10	0.05
47	0.28	0.29	0.70	0.14	0.07	0.18	0.11	0.15	-0.06	-0.02
48	0.22	0.29	0.09	0.04	0.17	0.52	0.01	0.01	0.17	0.33
49	0.31	0.09	0.38	0.18	0.12	0.14	-0.20	0.09	0.18	0.09
50	0.53	-0.18	0.31	0.01	0.11	-0.01	0.31	-0.06	0.36	0.04
51	0.28	0.06	0.61	0.16	0.17	0.28	0.03	0.09	0.18	0.41
52	0.45	0.14	0.62	0.12	0.10	0.07	0.17	0.21	-0.20	0.04
53	0.46	0.09	0.68	0.15	0.02	-0.02	0.21	0.02	0.21	-0.05
54	0.38	0.13	0.52	0.13	0.07	0.27	-0.03	0.14	0.15	0.34
55	0.25	0.23	0.69	0.04	0.04	0.21	0.36	0.14	0.21	0.11
56	0.12	0.32	0.26	0.18	-0.01	0.09	0.43	0.13	0.24	0.14

FACTOR LOADINGS FOR TOTAL SAMPLE

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	0.17	0.09	0.02	0.15	0.15	0.75	0.12	0.08	0.12	0.07
2	0.11	0.21	0.14	0.10	0.24	0.03	0.04	0.62	0.05	-0.01
3	0.48	0.04	0.19	-0.00	0.27	0.18	0.46	0.23	0.12	-0.05
4	0.44	0.20	0.03	0.23	0.57	0.07	-0.06	0.46	0.03	-0.25
5	0.67	0.08	0.10	0.02	0.11	0.10	0.08	0.35	0.11	0.00
6	0.30	0.13	0.34	0.06	0.11	0.72	0.13	0.17	0.03	0.04
7	0.72	0.20	0.07	0.14	-0.00	0.19	0.05	0.07	0.23	-0.12
8	0.43	0.40	0.12	0.18	-0.03	0.01	0.24	0.27	0.40	0.09
9	0.43	0.12	0.42	0.22	0.16	0.14	0.19	0.02	0.37	-0.00
10	0.69	0.13	0.05	0.07	0.15	0.15	0.13	0.08	0.37	0.01
11	0.30	0.45	0.08	-0.04	0.10	0.20	0.36	0.23	0.26	0.04
12	0.19	0.36	0.10	0.11	0.08	0.19	0.03	0.55	0.24	-0.03
13	0.22	0.36	0.08	0.37	0.09	0.18	0.14	0.33	0.38	-0.01
14	0.05	0.05	0.11	0.66	0.28	0.04	0.23	0.16	0.09	-0.16
15	0.16	-.24	0.05	0.74	-0.01	0.12	0.10	0.12	0.06	0.03
16	0.07	0.31	0.20	0.48	0.23	0.26	-0.03	0.16	0.17	0.22
17	0.21	0.14	0.35	0.12	0.62	0.20	0.13	0.12	-0.08	0.08
18	0.23	0.22	0.18	0.13	0.22	0.74	0.11	0.03	0.00	0.01
19	0.17	0.50	0.21	0.09	0.16	0.16	0.17	0.33	0.17	-0.10
20	0.62	0.30	0.12	0.21	-0.00	0.27	-0.18	0.09	0.13	0.05
21	0.14	0.07	0.75	0.12	0.12	0.33	0.05	0.09	0.04	0.04
22	0.84	0.13	0.11	0.08	0.10	0.03	0.04	0.10	0.04	0.12
23	0.51	0.26	0.21	-0.09	-.19	0.11	0.29	0.04	0.21	0.32
24	0.70	0.27	0.05	-0.01	0.02	0.01	0.06	0.27	-0.05	0.17
25	0.27	0.12	0.77	0.06	0.08	0.18	0.10	0.11	0.05	0.09
26	0.08	0.32	0.21	0.22	0.19	0.14	0.06	0.13	0.11	0.50
27	0.04	0.04	0.10	0.29	-0.06	0.04	0.11	0.67	-0.08	0.26
28	0.71	0.08	0.14	-0.07	0.08	0.09	0.23	0.02	-0.08	0.23
29	0.28	0.09	0.03	0.53	0.07	-0.16	-0.16	0.18	-0.07	0.31
30	0.75	0.20	-0.09	0.08	0.17	0.09	0.07	0.05	-0.02	0.05
31	0.25	0.34	0.16	0.11	0.43	-0.05	-0.07	0.08	0.48	0.14
32	0.72	0.21	0.23	0.19	0.14	0.06	-0.00	0.06	0.17	0.03
33	0.73	0.15	0.14	0.13	0.13	0.11	0.19	0.00	0.14	0.04
34	0.21	0.56	0.31	0.13	0.23	0.07	0.13	0.14	0.21	-0.12
35	0.29	0.31	0.17	0.08	0.60	0.23	0.14	0.00	0.06	-0.02
36	0.60	0.31	0.19	0.13	0.31	0.08	0.29	-0.02	0.05	-0.22
37	0.29	0.22	0.37	0.05	0.25	0.65	0.19	0.13	0.10	0.06
38	0.45	0.69	0.15	0.14	0.01	0.06	0.05	0.11	-0.07	-0.05
39	0.45	0.64	0.20	0.10	0.16	-0.02	-0.09	0.07	-0.15	-0.08
40	0.29	0.41	0.46	0.11	0.36	0.06	0.07	0.19	-0.11	0.14
41	0.45	0.33	0.12	0.17	0.08	0.18	0.25	0.19	-0.16	0.08
42	0.30	0.-1	-0.02	0.02	0.09	0.17	0.19	0.03	0.09	0.12
43	0.21	0.61	0.06	0.44	0.15	0.14	-0.02	0.17	-0.05	0.09
44	0.33	0.62	0.01	0.24	0.06	0.09	0.15	0.11	0.05	0.17
45	0.09	0.64	0.03	0.07	0.33	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.24	0.15
46	0.31	0.20	0.33	0.36	0.22	0.17	0.44	0.06	-0.02	-0.11
47	0.64	0.30	0.27	0.24	0.11	0.05	0.26	-0.01	0.03	-0.15
48	0.28	0.29	0.57	-0.01	0.17	0.10	0.32	0.21	0.12	0.13
49	0.46	0.12	0.09	0.17	0.17	0.10	0.58	0.11	-0.04	0.17
50	0.69	0.20	0.10	0.04	0.17	0.19	0.11	0.17	-0.07	0.13
51	0.51	0.25	0.26	0.10	0.09	0.21	0.51	0.03	0.11	-0.06
52	0.67	0.21	0.23	0.13	0.14	0.07	0.25	-0.01	0.10	-0.14
53	0.76	0.20	0.18	0.16	0.09	0.11	0.08	0.07	-0.03	-0.05
54	0.51	0.29	0.29	0.13	0.03	0.16	0.48	0.02	0.12	0.02
55	0.66	0.35	0.29	0.06	0.13	0.06	0.14	0.10	0.07	-0.17
56	0.37	0.52	0.29	0.21	-0.08	0.09	0.01	0.20	0.09	0.13

FACTOR LOADINGS FOR EXPERIENCED TEACHERS

1	0.14	0.14	0.11	0.06	0.10	0.00	0.05	0.10	0.12	0.82
2	-0.01	0.20	0.16	0.05	0.04	0.12	0.03	0.12	-0.02	0.17
3	0.56	0.18	0.29	-0.06	0.17	0.21	-0.06	0.00	-0.03	0.27
4	0.47	0.06	0.06	0.09	-0.05	0.66	0.01	0.08	0.12	0.01
5	0.73	0.09	0.12	0.06	0.11	0.18	0.09	-0.21	0.02	0.08
6	0.35	0.78	0.04	0.07	0.07	0.12	0.08	0.01	0.12	0.01
7	0.81	0.18	0.04	0.17	0.04	0.03	-0.05	0.10	-0.01	0.00
8	0.47	0.23	0.31	0.28	0.08	0.19	-0.13	0.14	0.25	-0.20
9	0.39	0.35	0.20	0.05	-0.08	0.04	0.17	0.02	0.23	0.25
10	0.72	0.20	0.13	0.05	0.10	0.02	0.07	0.11	-0.03	-0.06
11	0.46	0.30	0.46	0.19	0.06	-0.21	-0.27	-0.07	0.05	-0.20
12	0.03	0.29	0.15	0.21	0.12	0.69	0.03	0.22	-0.11	0.04
13	0.29	0.38	0.23	0.01	0.37	0.24	0.17	0.50	0.08	-0.16
14	0.12	0.02	0.08	-0.04	0.09	-0.03	0.01	0.19	0.05	0.06
15	0.18	-0.00	0.07	0.04	-0.07	0.11	0.03	0.86	0.06	0.12
16	0.04	0.51	-0.04	0.17	0.52	0.25	0.04	0.23	0.17	0.05
17	0.20	0.29	0.11	0.18	0.52	0.17	0.29	-0.25	-0.04	0.29
18	0.31	0.71	0.06	0.15	0.04	0.19	-0.05	-0.10	0.06	-0.01
19	0.15	0.26	0.72	0.20	0.06	0.07	0.13	0.14	0.08	0.23
20	0.55	0.16	0.09	0.13	0.34	0.03	0.49	0.09	0.07	-0.01
21	0.14	0.76	0.29	-0.16	0.07	-0.01	-0.00	0.03	0.09	0.10
22	0.88	0.01	0.06	0.09	0.16	-0.04	0.21	-0.00	0.03	0.10
23	0.65	0.34	0.12	0.15	0.15	-0.17	-0.18	-0.03	0.30	0.10
24	0.64	0.06	-0.06	0.41	0.12	0.14	0.24	0.20	0.07	0.06
25	0.27	0.68	0.36	0.07	0.18	0.07	0.14	0.06	0.10	0.07
26	0.01	0.12	0.10	0.19	0.08	0.01	0.20	0.04	0.80	0.19
27	0.03	0.11	0.02	-0.05	-0.04	0.17	-0.08	-0.01	0.07	-0.03
28	0.81	0.20	0.09	0.09	-0.08	0.14	0.11	-0.05	0.12	0.12
29	0.20	-0.01	0.20	-0.03	-0.01	0.03	0.82	0.06	0.17	0.08
30	0.72	0.03	0.09	0.24	0.22	-0.12	0.21	0.15	-0.13	-0.00
31	0.28	0.13	0.33	0.19	0.68	-0.05	-0.09	-0.00	0.18	0.11
32	0.79	0.18	0.03	0.16	-0.03	0.06	0.28	0.17	-0.04	-0.06
33	0.82	0.09	0.10	0.07	-0.01	0.01	0.04	0.14	0.01	0.03
34	0.11	0.18	0.71	0.15	0.15	0.14	0.20	0.08	0.03	-0.04
35	0.25	0.28	0.43	0.29	0.23	0.01	0.11	0.18	0.06	0.22
36	0.77	0.13	0.19	0.19	0.07	0.27	-0.02	-0.04	0.02	0.13
37	0.37	0.78	0.18	0.17	0.07	0.03	-0.05	0.09	0.05	0.09
38	0.44	0.17	0.30	0.58	-0.07	0.13	0.21	0.17	0.22	-0.07
39	0.38	-0.03	0.19	0.66	0.05	0.15	0.25	-0.08	0.10	-0.00
40	0.36	0.19	0.45	0.44	0.05	0.28	0.04	-0.09	0.11	-0.01
41	0.50	0.28	0.37	0.08	0.17	-0.12	0.26	0.17	0.14	-0.22
42	0.36	0.08	0.19	0.47	0.29	-0.04	-0.13	0.10	0.42	-0.25
43	0.29	0.06	0.24	0.29	0.32	0.33	0.11	0.49	0.19	0.08
44	0.33	0.14	0.37	-0.02	0.31	0.34	0.17	0.18	0.37	-0.10
45	0.09	0.15	0.18	0.73	0.23	0.09	-0.23	0.10	0.10	0.19
46	0.44	0.38	0.19	0.20	-0.16	0.13	0.18	0.24	-0.06	0.22
47	0.71	0.21	0.08	0.12	0.10	0.24	0.10	0.15	0.23	-0.04
48	0.41	0.41	0.52	0.17	0.03	-0.10	-0.14	-0.12	0.25	0.24
49	0.71	0.10	0.15	-0.11	0.13	0.18	-0.24	0.12	0.14	0.24
50	0.77	0.17	0.04	0.09	0.16	0.04	0.07	0.06	0.12	0.20
51	0.75	0.20	0.26	-0.00	-0.15	-0.00	-0.20	0.11	0.21	0.07
52	0.68	0.25	0.36	-0.12	0.09	0.21	-0.01	0.03	-0.01	-0.01
53	0.75	0.23	-0.02	0.17	-0.00	0.01	0.30	0.22	-0.06	-0.12
54	0.68	0.34	0.32	0.05	-0.03	0.12	0.04	0.14	0.26	-0.01
55	0.79	0.29	0.09	0.19	0.15	0.13	0.05	0.01	-0.02	-0.09
56	0.43	0.25	0.34	0.10	0.21	0.31	0.16	0.17	0.33	-0.19

FACTOR LOADINGS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS

1	-0.01	-0.01	0.19	0.19	0.84	-0.03	0.19	-0.04	0.06	-0.10
2	0.47	0.02	0.07	0.26	0.31	-0.10	-0.05	-0.01	0.13	0.26
3	0.34	0.39	-0.09	0.13	0.23	0.25	-0.00	0.24	0.45	-0.10
4	0.39	-0.05	-0.09	0.54	0.25	-0.03	-0.05	0.13	0.25	0.26
5	0.72	0.10	-0.06	0.09	0.12	0.09	0.24	0.08	0.23	0.15
6	0.29	0.36	0.04	-0.06	0.29	0.16	0.62	0.16	0.09	0.06
7	0.74	0.04	0.16	0.19	-0.07	0.06	0.17	0.19	0.08	0.10
8	0.35	0.09	0.27	0.21	0.02	0.43	-0.05	-0.25	0.31	0.41
9	0.50	0.50	0.17	0.14	0.07	0.35	0.08	0.14	0.24	0.13
10	0.65	0.23	0.33	0.17	0.07	0.11	0.10	-0.01	0.27	-0.05
11	0.11	0.19	0.30	0.59	0.12	0.24	0.11	0.07	0.12	-0.03
12	0.20	0.03	0.14	0.12	0.14	0.17	0.11	0.09	0.75	0.21
13	0.05	0.22	0.17	0.49	0.13	0.17	0.16	0.22	0.36	0.37
14	0.16	0.11	0.17	0.72	0.24	0.08	-0.02	0.07	0.10	0.10
15	0.16	0.06	0.51	0.47	0.11	0.06	0.13	0.14	0.06	0.36
16	-0.06	0.42	0.46	0.42	-0.04	0.03	0.30	0.10	-0.09	0.26
17	-0.01	0.34	-0.08	0.35	0.54	0.15	0.20	0.05	0.11	0.03
18	0.16	0.18	0.21	0.09	0.26	0.15	0.72	0.21	-0.03	0.01
19	0.30	0.01	0.21	0.17	0.04	0.14	0.23	0.16	0.20	0.13
20	0.39	0.04	0.34	0.05	-0.04	0.33	0.43	0.01	0.13	0.10
21	0.13	0.73	0.07	0.16	0.13	0.02	0.27	0.13	-0.01	0.08
22	0.55	0.35	0.14	0.03	0.01	0.15	0.24	0.32	0.00	0.01
23	0.22	0.47	0.40	0.12	0.02	0.09	-0.05	0.10	0.50	-0.17
24	0.36	0.17	0.12	0.15	-0.09	0.06	-0.01	0.67	0.13	0.02
25	0.11	0.77	0.07	0.14	0.08	0.15	0.24	0.15	0.10	0.22
26	0.17	0.29	0.35	0.31	0.01	-0.11	0.43	-0.07	0.07	0.11
27	0.25	0.04	0.19	0.02	-0.12	-0.15	0.05	0.18	0.30	0.51
28	0.43	0.38	0.03	-0.02	-0.16	0.09	0.18	0.43	-0.06	-0.33
29	0.01	0.19	0.08	0.09	-0.02	0.06	-0.01	0.03	-0.04	0.82
30	0.29	0.23	0.08	0.21	0.07	-0.04	0.06	0.23	-0.02	0.00
31	0.19	0.35	0.44	0.20	0.41	-0.19	0.04	0.08	0.30	-0.08
32	0.30	0.44	0.38	0.04	0.28	0.12	0.12	0.07	0.25	-0.03
33	0.49	0.16	0.14	0.23	0.15	0.34	0.40	0.09	0.21	-0.09
34	0.10	0.24	0.41	0.57	0.19	0.16	0.14	0.10	0.09	-0.13
35	0.07	0.09	0.07	0.13	0.79	0.24	0.19	0.04	0.13	0.07
36	0.26	0.21	0.24	0.45	0.42	0.37	-0.02	0.22	-0.18	0.01
37	0.19	0.43	0.20	0.16	0.35	0.18	0.58	0.19	0.21	-0.06
38	0.14	0.15	0.43	0.21	0.16	0.47	0.12	0.37	-0.03	0.14
39	0.24	0.34	0.51	0.06	0.29	0.29	-0.02	0.18	-0.01	0.08
40	0.24	0.38	0.28	0.29	0.53	-0.03	-0.06	0.36	0.00	0.08
41	0.13	0.08	0.12	0.15	0.23	0.11	0.26	0.77	0.12	0.12
42	0.11	0.11	0.49	0.25	0.18	0.36	0.27	0.03	0.16	-0.07
43	0.13	0.03	0.56	0.24	0.35	0.05	0.21	-0.01	0.17	0.33
44	0.10	-0.04	0.67	0.27	0.17	0.19	0.25	0.30	0.10	0.06
45	0.00	0.10	0.46	0.35	0.24	-0.01	0.30	0.04	0.43	-0.12
46	0.34	0.27	0.06	0.62	0.18	0.31	0.12	0.28	0.06	0.06
47	0.58	0.25	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.39	-0.02	0.37	-0.09	0.09
48	0.22	0.70	0.23	0.26	0.11	0.19	0.10	0.03	0.15	0.16
49	0.08	0.23	-0.01	0.31	0.01	0.35	0.26	0.53	0.32	0.22
50	0.24	0.34	0.11	-0.08	0.41	0.24	0.33	0.39	-0.02	0.07
51	0.27	0.21	0.17	0.21	0.22	0.56	0.40	0.07	0.26	0.04
52	0.59	0.34	0.19	0.09	0.27	0.30	0.04	0.28	-0.11	0.00
53	0.33	0.48	0.24	0.00	0.29	0.42	0.05	0.13	0.05	-0.08
54	0.22	0.17	0.21	0.21	0.07	0.74	0.27	0.12	0.14	0.01
55	0.30	0.33	0.29	0.14	-0.35	0.46	-0.05	0.29	0.05	-0.11
56	0.19	0.31	0.67	-0.03	-0.04	0.32	0.09	-0.01	0.14	0.25

APPENDIX B

TEACHER CONCERNS CHECKLIST

TEACHER CONCERNS CHECKLIST

Frances F. Fuller

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

Name _____ Male ___ Female ___ Age ___

DIRECTIONS: This checklist is designed to explore what teachers are concerned about at different points in their careers. There are, of course, no right or wrong answers; each person has his or her own concerns.

We consider you to be "concerned" about a thing if you think about it frequently and would like to do something about it personally. You are not concerned about a thing simply because you believe it is important--if it seldom crosses your mind, if you are satisfied with the current state of affairs, do not say you are concerned about it. You may be concerned about problems, but you may also be concerned about opportunities which could be realized. You may be concerned about things you are not currently dealing with, but only if you anticipate dealing with them and frequently think about them from this point of view. In short, you are concerned about it if you often think about it and would like to do something about it.

On the following pages, you will find statements about some things related to teaching. Read each statement. Then ask yourself: WHEN I THINK ABOUT MY TEACHING, HOW MUCH AM I CONCERNED ABOUT THIS?

If you are not concerned about that now, circle "1."

If you are a little concerned, circle "2."

If you are moderately concerned, circle "3."

If you are very concerned, circle "4."

And if you are extremely concerned, circle "5."

BE SURE TO ANSWER EVERY ITEM.

Read each statement, then ask yourself:

WHEN I THINK ABOUT MY TEACHING, HOW MUCH AM I CONCERNED ABOUT THIS?

1 = Not concerned 5 = Extremely concerned

1.	Lack of respect of some students.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Standards and regulations set for teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Selecting and teaching content well.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	The mandated curriculum is not appropriate for all students.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Whether students are learning what they should.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Whether the students really like me or not.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Increasing students' feelings of accomplishment.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	The nature and quality of instructional materials.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Where I stand as a teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Motivating students to study.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Working productively with other teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Lack of instructional materials.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Rapid rate of curriculum and instructional change.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Feeling under pressure too much of the time.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	The routine and inflexibility of the situation.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Becoming too personally involved with students.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Maintaining the appropriate degree of class control.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Acceptance as a friend by students.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Understanding the principal's policies.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	The wide range of student achievement.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	Doing well when a supervisor is present.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Meeting the needs of different kinds of students.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	Being fair and impartial.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	Diagnosing student learning problems.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	Getting a favorable evaluation of my teaching.	1	2	3	4	5

1 = Not concerned 5 = Extremely concerned

26.	Being asked personal questions by my students.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	Too many noninstructional duties.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	Insuring that students grasp subject matter fundamentals.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	Working with too many students each day.	1	2	3	4	5
30.	Challenging unmotivated students.	1	2	3	4	5
31.	The values and attitudes of the current generation.	1	2	3	4	5
32.	Adapting myself to the needs of different students.	1	2	3	4	5
33.	Whether students can apply what they learn.	1	2	3	4	5
34.	Understanding the philosophy of the school.	1	2	3	4	5
35.	Students who disrupt classes.	1	2	3	4	5
36.	Instilling worthwhile concepts and values.	1	2	3	4	5
37.	How students feel about me.	1	2	3	4	5
38.	Student health and nutrition problems that affect learning.	1	2	3	4	5
39.	The psychological climate of the school.	1	2	3	4	5
40.	Clarifying the limits of my authority and responsibility.	1	2	3	4	5
41.	Assessing and reporting student progress.	1	2	3	4	5
42.	Chronic absence and dropping out of students.	1	2	3	4	5
43.	Lack of academic freedom.	1	2	3	4	5
44.	Teaching required content to students of varied background.	1	2	3	4	5
45.	Student use of drugs.	1	2	3	4	5
46.	Feeling more adequate as a teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
47.	Guiding students toward intellectual and emotional growth.	1	2	3	4	5
48.	Being accepted and respected by professional persons.	1	2	3	4	5
49.	Adequately presenting all of the required material.	1	2	3	4	5
50.	Slow progress of certain students.	1	2	3	4	5
51.	My ability to present ideas to the class.	1	2	3	4	5
52.	Helping students to value learning.	1	2	3	4	5

1 = Not concerned 5 = Extremely concerned

53.	Whether each student is getting what he needs.	1	2	3	4	5
54.	Increasing my proficiency in content.	1	2	3	4	5
55.	Recognizing the social and emotional needs of students.	1	2	3	4	5
56.	The wide diversity of student ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds.	1	2	3	4	5

Please use the rest of this page for any comments. These may be about the questionnaire in general, about specific items or about any additional concerns you may have.

REFERENCES

Fuller, F. Concerns of Teachers: A Developmental Conceptualization. American Educational Research Journal, 1969, 6(2), 207-226.

Fuller, F. and Case, C. Concerns of Teachers: A Manual for Use With the Teacher Concerns Statement. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1970.

Fuller, F., Parsons, J. and Watkins, J. Concerns of Teachers: Research and Reconceptualization. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1973.

George, A. Addendum to Analysis of Five Hypothesized Factors on the Teacher Concerns Checklist, Form B. Verbal report delivered with paper presented at AERA, 1974.

George, A. Analysis of Five Hypothesized Factors on the Teacher Concerns Checklist, Form B. The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1974.

George, A. Measuring Self, Task, and Impact Concerns: A Manual for Use of the Teacher Concerns Questionnaire. The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1978.

George, A., Borich, G., and Fuller, F. Progress Report on Research on the Teacher Concerns Checklist. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1974.

Parsons, J. and Fuller, F. Concerns of Teachers: Reliability, Bipolarity and Relationship to Teaching Experience. Paper presented at 1972 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

The cost of printing this publication by Western Kentucky University was paid from state funds KRS 57.375.